



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 6
1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200
DALLAS, TX 75202-2733

June 17, 2005

Magalie R. Salas, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St., N.E. Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Docket Nos: CP04-386-000, CP04-400-000, CP04-401-000, CP04-402-000

Dear Ms. Salas:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 has reviewed the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the proposed construction and operation of the liquefied natural gas (LNG) import terminal(Jefferson County, Texas) and natural gas pipelines (Jefferson, Orange and Newton counties, Texas and Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana) proposed by Golden Pass LNG Terminal and Pipeline Project. The Golden Pass LNG proposed facility would transport up to 2.0 billion cubic feet per day of imported natural gas to the U.S. market.

We previously offered comments on the scoping documents, the Draft EIS, the sediment testing results, and the wetland mitigation plan and we have no comments on additional subjects. However, we found the Coast Guard response to one of the EPA comments on the DEIS is the same response put forth on the Cheniere Corpus Christi LNG project. In that case, we responded with the following information, which would also be appropriate in this case.

We appreciate the information on Coast Guard operating standards and mandatory practices that was provided in the response to our comment regarding the potential for invasive species introductions from increased foreign vessel traffic. This information provided us adequate assurances that best management practices are in place to address this specific concern. However, one aspect of the response does not seem to align with ecological principles and we suggest that this verbiage not be included in other LNG NEPA documents. Specifically, refer to the Final EIS, Volume 2, Response to Federal Agency Comments, EPA comment F.5.4: "... the local biotic community is likely adapted to a regular influx of exogenous organisms." We see two problems with this statement. First, it presumes that specific ecological adaptations are at work but those adaptations are left undocumented in the text. Second, although a direct response to the concern was prepared, this statement seems to dismiss the issue as a valid concern. As you know, it is the one exotic species that takes off (i.e., becomes invasive) that can severely impact an ecosystem. Please call Barbara Keeler at (214) 665-6698, if you have questions about these comments.

EPA appreciates the opportunity to review the FEIS.

Sincerely yours,

/S/

Rhonda M. Smith, Acting Chief
Office of Planning and
Coordination (6EN-XP)